



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

DIPLOMATIC AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL LAW, 1910

PAUL S. REINSCH

University of Wisconsin

The year 1910 continued the era of peace and comparative quiet in international affairs which the world has enjoyed since the end of the Russo-Japanese War. The electoral and party struggles in Great Britain, involving fundamental constitutional issues, the revolutionary changes in Portugal, the political and social unrest in Spain, the development of the constitutional régime in Turkey, are indeed all facts which considered separately are of the highest interest and which in their joint effect will exert a profound influence also in the field of international relations. But as to these latter themselves, they were free from startling features and dramatic climaxes such as delight the journalist and the war-scare monger. This is not to say that things of the highest significance were not accomplished, that understandings of moment were not given definite form during this year; even some unexpected things came about, but, on the whole, international relations were placid and followed the quiet course of natural development. Yet to the careful observer of international affairs the situations and tendencies that have appeared to the view during this year are of the highest significance. Indeed it may almost be said that some entirely new principles in the action of world politics have been revealed through the groupings and relations of the powers as effected in 1910.

During this year the consequences of the facts accompanying the the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina were clearly brought out in their full effect upon international action. The demonstration that there existed in central Europe a compact partnership of powers which would be ready at a decisive moment to

risk the danger of war, had a profound effect, not only upon Russia upon whom the incidence of this force had first fallen, but upon every other power in the world. When after the Russo-Japanese War the first beginnings of the Triple *Entente* were revealed at the Algeciras conference, Germany seemed to be taken by surprise. She had not expected that Russia would so soon forget the friendly neutrality of Germany during the war and would thus early be found obstructing German policies. The whole action of Germany throughout the Morocco affair, while it indicated a justifiable self-confidence and reliance upon her vast military resources, seemed to carry this feeling too far and, competing with other nations, to claim a position with respect to Morocco which would not willingly be accorded and which could have been extorted only through sacrifices entirely incommensurate with what was to be gained. Germany became for awhile isolated and the Triple *Entente* seemed to be in a position to control the European situation. Even then, however, it could have been foreseen that the community of interest between these three powers was not so great as to make a joint policy of hegemony possible. There might be a joint resistance to extravagant demands on the part of some one power, but a constructive policy of leadership requires a greater compactness of interests and organization. These facts which apparently had been fully grasped by some German diplomats two years ago were soon to be proven by the test of action. When the Austro-Hungarian Empire announced its intention to turn the occupation of Bosnia and Herzegovina into formally sovereign control, Russia attempted to initiate a policy of obstruction to this design by backing Serbia in her objections. The opportunity had now arrived for Germany to demonstrate the essential weakness of the Triple *Entente*, which was done by informing Russia that Germany would not desert her ally, should an armed conflict occur over the question at issue. It is the consequences of this situation and action that has become fully apparent during the year 1910.

The demonstration that a positive policy could not be pursued by the Triple *Entente*, of course, bore its most immediate effects in the Near East itself. The new Turkish government, forget-

ting any debt of gratitude it might owe the French and English for early encouragements, turned quite decidedly to the Central European powers. There were, of course, many reasons why this result should have been brought about; although at the time when the new Turkish government was set up it hardly seemed that Germany, the supporter of the old régime, would exercise much influence with the new. But the brilliant diplomacy of Baron Marshall knew how to utilize the promising elements in the situation with such success that in an incredibly short time the ascendancy of Germany at the Golden Horn was completely restored. The elements in the situation favorable to such an outcome were several. Turkey has not yet come to look upon Russia as other than the enemy of past years, the plotter against Turkish ascendancy, and the aspirant for dominion over Turkish lands. The temporary weakening of Russia through the Japanese War had not abated her interest in developing her influence in the Balkans. Turkey, therefore, more readily than was anticipated came to terms with Austria concerning everything relating to the annexed provinces, as the controversy itself had revealed the continued ambitions of Russia for influence in these regions. The fact that Great Britain and France were allied with Russia therefore, did not help their influence in Constantinople. These powers further, unfortunately for themselves, constituted the protectors of Crete, a relation which the Central European powers had wisely avoided being drawn into. The negotiations connected with this affair would not exactly conduce to make the protecting powers more welcome to the Turkish government. But it is also a noteworthy fact that under the new régime in Turkey Islamite feeling, far from being suppressed, has remained a strong political factor as it was under Hamid; at times it would seem that it had even grown more pervasive. All the powers of the Triple *Entente* have possessions inhabited by Mohammedans. Great Britain and Russia are attempting to tighten their grip upon Persia; France is endeavoring to extend her sway eastward from Tunis over regions of Tripoli. In striking contrast, the German Emperor stands in the light of his words at the Tomb of Saladin as the special friend of Mohammedan peoples. These were some

of the elements that, with the tactful handling of the keen German diplomat at the Porte, resulted in a rapid loss by Great Britain and France of any temporary ascendancy they might have obtained as an immediate result of the Turkish Revolution.

But if Turkey was powerfully affected by the proof of compact strength given by Germany in the Balkan crisis, this was no less true of Russia herself. Many factors coöperate in making the Triple *Entente*, as far as Russia is concerned, a matter of somewhat superficial and temporary convenience. There can be no essential sympathy and oneness of feeling between governments so different as the Tzardom of Russia, the radical republic of France, the liberal administration of Great Britain. There were indeed valid reasons in national interest for the formation of the Triple *Entente*, and this understanding has been one of the principal factors in giving us the reign of peace we are now enjoying. From the point of view of every one of the members it rested upon sound views of national policy. But it was not of a kind to command single-hearted devotion on the part of all of them, and especially of Russia. It could scarcely become more than what it started out to be, an *entente*, a friendly understanding. We have already considered its inability to act as an alliance for the constructive control of international affairs. But the Russian government had many special reasons after the Bosnian affair to look for other guiding principles than singlehearted coöperation with her other two allies. The reactionary proceedings of the Russian government with respect to Finland and Poland met with severe condemnation in both England and France, numerous members of the French parliament even joining in a special message to the Tzar on these matters. The stirrings of republicanism in Portugal and in Spain, too, would naturally have an immediate reflex effect upon the relations between France and Russia. France as an isolated republic may be so harmless as to be the chosen consort of the Russian autocracy; but as the elder sister of a Southern European republican group, she is viewed with considerable less enthusiasm from the banks of the Neva. So Russia bethought herself that an empire with many interests and relations could not govern her policy with reference to only two

foreign powers. She accepted the inevitable with respect to the action of Austria-Hungary and seemed to be desirous of withdrawing into herself for awhile, making peace with all her neighbors and engaging in the development of her resources and the reconstruction of her inner organization. The change in her foreign policy was indicated by the dismissal of M. Isvolsky from the foreign office, and his appointment to be ambassador at Paris.

Signs of a continually better understanding with Germany were not wanting. The Emperor and Tzar had an unusually friendly meeting, diplomatic relations were restored with Austria-Hungary, and many courtesies passed between these three powers together with acts of mutual accommodation in minor matters. Finally in December, 1910, it was announced that an agreement had been arrived at between Germany and Russia with respect to Persia. Germany agreed to respect the interest acquired by Russia in northern Persia, while the latter power promised its good will and support with respect to the German enterprise connected with the Bagdad railway. The British public seemed to be surprised at this action and to look upon it as amounting to a desertion of the Triple *Entente* on the part of Russia. Yet it by no means need involve a decision of that power to interrupt its close and friendly relations with England and France. It is in this case simply adjusting matters with one of its neighbors. If events had shown that Great Britain and France could not effectively support Russia in a forward movement in the Balkans, why should Russia use her strength in the Middle East entirely to assist the plans of Great Britain in that section?

The most significant results of this new manner of viewing international relations, however, were embodied in the treaty concluded between Japan and Russia on July 4, 1910. This move some publicists explain as due to the mutual force of attraction exercised by the Triple *Entente* and the Anglo-Japanese alliance through the medium of Great Britain. But it seems far from sound to attribute the conciliation of Russia with her enemy to the *Entente*, the weakness of which had just been conspicuously demonstrated. The conclusion of this treaty must be attributed

to other causes, it would seem, in fact, to the same causes which brought about closer the relations between Russia and Germany. Russia for the time being wants no forward policy in any direction, with the possible exception of northern Persia where there is no serious impediment. Her desire to recuperate and re-organize her forces of national life and imperial power lead her to make arrangements with neighbors along lines of converging or parallel interests. Had she desired immediately to recover her losses in Manchuria, her plans for the uniform and complete development of her resources would have had to be sacrificed to this one aim, which would therefore have involved the necessity of foregoing all influence in other regions bordering on her frontiers. Moreover, under present circumstances the reconquest of southern Manchuria would have been a futile policy. On the other hand, her interests and those of Japan in Manchuria are parallel, they rest upon the same titles and are threatened by the same dangers. By joining hands with Japan, Russia could therefore most effectually protect what has remained to her, against loss and embarrassment. Both Russia and Japan are acting in derogation of Chinese sovereignty; with the growing strength and efficiency of the Chinese empire, the position of either of these occupants might soon be more or less in danger. But united, they will be for a long time able to hold the advantages which they have acquired and even to expand them.

The treaty of July 4th is the natural result of the arrangements made by the treaty of Portsmouth. The idea that Russia and Japan were driven into this alliance as a result of the American policy in China is just as superficial as it would be to attribute this development to the existence of the Triple *Entente*. It is a natural consequence of the new attitude which Russia has assumed as a result of the experience gained in the diplomatic conflict with Austria-Hungary. The suggestion of Mr. Knox that the Manchurian railways should be neutralized, and the efforts put forward to construct a Chinese railway through western Manchuria to the Amur River, indeed served to crystallize the feeling of a common interest between Japan and Russia. But this part of the general policy inaugurated by the American

government of having all foreign enterprise in China conducted upon an international basis and thus protecting the Chinese Empire against dismemberment, need not be blamed as the primary cause of the Russo-Japanese Treaty; nor would it be at all clear-sighted to interpret that understanding as an alliance in any way directed against the United States. While opinions may differ as to the advantage of having made this specific proposal of Manchurian neutralization, the general policy of which it forms a part, is a wise and natural one for the United States to adopt; just as natural also is the fact that Japan and Russia were drawn together for the purpose of protecting their parallel interests in Manchuria. If China is to be saved the complete loss of her Manchurian dominion, it will come about through the maintenance of international interests in that dependency, which, compatible with the special interest acquired by Russia and Japan, will, nevertheless, keep alive the exercise of Chinese sovereignty until eventually China may be strong enough to exercise her power more effectively so as to prevent further encroachments and perhaps even to secure a retrocession of some of the things she has at present lost.

One result of the proposal of the American Secretary of State was that Russia and Japan were forced to show their hand and to come out into the open with respect to their Manchurian policy. Up to this time both of these powers had vowed that they desired both to maintain Chinese sovereignty and to favor the policy of the open door. But at the first attempt to make it possible for China to develop parts of Manchuria on her own account, the two occupying powers united in defence of their acquired possession; they virtually divided this dependency between themselves and declared that their interest is so paramount as to exclude even enterprises desired by the sovereign country itself. Shortly after the publication of the Russo-Japanese agreement, the Chinese government issued a statement calling attention to the provisions of the Portsmouth Treaty as well as of the treaties concluded by herself with Russia and Japan, by which the sovereign rights of China are acknowledged.

By publicists gifted with a constructive imagination a complete

alignment of the great powers is deduced from recent events. The understanding between Russia, France, and Great Britain, has been expanded into a quadruple *entente* by the inclusion of Japan. By a similar force of gravitation, the United States which has been espousing the interests of China is drawn to the side of the Triple Alliance. Thus the world is neatly divided up into two sections and the vast armageddon may begin at any given signal. But the facts do not bear out such hard and fast constructions, they indicate a far different situation.

The most significant tendency revealed in international life during the past year is that which favors the alignment of states in friendly but not mutually exclusive groups. For a time it seemed that we should have an era of definite alliances, confronting each other with thinly veiled hostility. Then the essential weakness of the Triple *Entente* was demonstrated—a weakness not in joint resistance but in joint advance movements. As the era in which states could exist in complete isolation has past, so has that of hard and fast alliances. Through the technical advances which the last hundred years have seen, nations have been bound together by innumerable and complex relationships. If a close and friendly understanding is arrived at with one country this does not exclude the existence of numerous interests held in common with others. A government heeding the behests of national life in all its directions will, therefore, feel impelled to coöperate now with this neighbor and now with that, and at times with all of them. An alliance which would confine positive action to the interests of a narrow group of powers would be in conflict with that freedom which national life at present demands. However, an understanding to preserve the peace, to resist encroachments, to oppose individual ambitions, is possible and may be highly effective. In this sense the Triple *Entente* has not lost its meaning. But when it attempted to act in a positive manner in proposing a definite policy of advance for all the powers included in it, its operation immediately ceased to be effective.

The machinery of modern civilization is most intricate. Its operations within the area of any state depend on innumerable factors which are not confined to that area but influence it from

a distance. Isolation as well as connection in exclusive alliances would cut all these natural relations; the web of world-wide activity and interests would be broken, participation in which means prosperity to any individual country. The result of a clear recognition of these facts is very favorable to the maintenance of peace. By a complex series of agreements nations come to mutual understandings on a great many matters that would formerly have caused dangerous irritation. From this point of view the international events of the year 1910 are most informing. The chain of consequences set in motion by the firm attitude of the greatest military power of the world has served to demonstrate how strong are the influences for peace and how much a nation may gain by being guided in its international arrangements by a desire to establish connections with all who are pursuing similar interests. But it would, of course, be premature to expect the entire abolition of war, the disappearance of all danger of armed conflict, from the facts thus revealed to us. The readiness with which wide international interests now crystallize is, of course, most reassuring. And yet it is possible that the focalization may at times be so determined that two groups of states apparently equally powerful will be confronted upon an issue so fundamental that neither side will yield. But while such a constellation of events is possible, there is nothing in the immediate future of the world that would threaten so great a danger, while the warlike impulses of individual nations are powerfully restrained by the recognition of those many bonds of international interests, the operation of which has been so clearly demonstrated during the past year.

WESTERN EUROPE

International relations throughout Western Europe were marked with an exceptionally friendly tone during this year. The feeling of intense competition which exists between Great Britain and Germany was moderated by many attempts to arrive at a better mutual understanding. Declarations in the parliaments, such as those made by the German Chancellor, March 7 and again December 10, emphasized the existence of a friendly feeling be-

tween the governments. Sir Ernest Cassel devoted the sum of \$1,000,000 to the creation of an institution to mediate between English and German public opinion. The Archbishop of Canterbury presided at the session of a committee of churchmen to bring about friendly feeling between the two countries. Unofficial or semi-official action of this kind shows how the constant fostering of suspicion and hatred which has been going on in sections of the press of both countries, is beginning to wear upon the public. Meanwhile, however, the competition in naval armaments continues for the time being. By January 1911, the following advance had been made in the creation of a navy of dreadnaught vessels; Great Britain had completed 12 such ships, had launched 16, and had laid down 22; Germany had completed 5, launched 11, and laid down 13. When all these ships are completed, within two or three years, Great Britain will, therefore, have 50, Germany 29, vessels of the most advanced class. The cost of new armaments for the decade from 1901-1910 was £111,000,000 for Great Britain, £63,000,000 for Germany. As will be seen from all these figures the British navy at present and prospectively is very nearly doubly as strong as that of Germany. No material change in this relation is immediately to be expected although the size of the German navy is, of course, relatively gaining. The terrible crisis which was promised for the year 1913 when the German navy was to be practically equal to the British in efficiency is therefore not in actual prospect. Both countries are developing their naval armament with great energy, but talk of an inevitable deadly combat between them is heard less frequently now than it was a year ago. Nevertheless, the rivalry between Great Britain and Germany still remains one of the most cardinal facts in the international situation.

The relations between France and Germany have also continued to improve. There have been many mutual visits of learned bodies and associations of various kinds. On March 25, a treaty was concluded between these two countries, which provides for the mutual protection and use of the national sub-marine cables. The Franco-German arrangements with respect to Morocco have been adhered to in good faith which has increased mutual confi-

dence between these countries. In Morocco the French, as trustees of the European powers, have labored to perfect the policing of the internal regions. Arrangements have been made for the establishment of a mining code under which the mining operations of foreigners in Morocco are to be regulated. A commission has been established in Tangier to adjudicate upon claims of foreigners against Morocco.

The revolution in Portugal and the establishment of a republican form of government did not lead to any international complications, with the exception that diplomatic relations between Portugal and the Vatican were completely broken and the papal nunciature at Lisbon was discontinued. The only nunciatures of the first rank now remaining are those at Madrid and at Vienna. The republican government of Portugal was recognized first by Switzerland, and thereupon by other European and American powers, in most cases only for purposes of ordinary official intercourse, pending a more formal recognition when the systems of republican authorities shall have been organized on a permanent basis.

The relations between Spain and the Vatican also became exceedingly strained during 1910. Sr. Canalejas, the Prime Minister and a representative statesman of the Liberal party, undertook to revise the laws of Spain relating to the religious establishments. His government revived an older decree which requires the public registry of all religious associations so as to bring them to some extent under the control of the state. A decree was also issued allowing non-Catholic churches to use signs and inscriptions that indicate their character as places of worship. On the part of the Vatican it was claimed that there should be no legislation while diplomatic negotiations were going on concerning these very matters. Finally the Spanish government also passed a measure, commonly called the "Padlock Law," which prohibits the establishment of new religious societies in Spain during the course of negotiations. This also is by the Vatican considered in the light of a unilateral modification of treaty arrangements between it and the Spanish government. As a result of this friction the papal nuncio was withdrawn from Madrid, although he remained within Spanish territory.

THE NEAR EAST

The Cretan situation continued throughout the year without a satisfactory adjustment being possible. On May 9, the Cretan legislative chamber convened and opened its sessions in the name of the King of Greece. One hundred and twenty-four of the deputies belonged to the orthodox or Greek party; they all took the oath of allegiance to the Greek crown, thus confirming the annexation of Crete which had been voted two years previously. The small minority of Mohammedan members were excluded upon their refusal to swear allegiance. When the Greek parliamentary elections came on, a number of Cretan deputies were elected to take part in the Athenian parliament. This situation obliged the protecting powers to take a stand for or against annexation to Greece. The Greek government too was put in a very difficult position because the refusal to admit Cretan deputies would have aroused the entire Greek nation to a revolutionary movement. On the other hand, the annexation of Crete would undoubtedly have led to a declaration of war by Turkey. On July 8, the protecting powers informed the Cretan authorities that military occupation of the island would be resumed if the Mohammedan members were not admitted to the legislative chamber. They were, in consequence of this, granted formal admission but the legislature adjourned immediately thereafter so as not to have to act jointly with them. While the Cretan deputies were admitted to the Greek parliament, and one of them, Venezelos, even became prime minister, an arrangement was made concerning their relation to Crete which satisfied the Turkish government.

As the financial situation of the Turkish government had not improved, an attempt was made again in the summer of 1910 to raise a foreign loan. The new government, however, desired to depart from the traditional practice which had thus far been insisted upon by creditors that special security should be given in the form of the receipts from certain taxes. Djavid Pasha, the Minister of Finance, first attempted to raise this money in France, the great source of public loans. The French government, however, was not predisposed to go out of its way to assist Turkey at this time, when that country seemed to be drawn more and

more towards the Central European powers. The French, therefore, demanded not only special security but also a more direct part in the control of Turkish finance. As these conditions were not acceptable, the Turkish minister next tried to secure a loan in London, but though some bankers who had helped on a former occasion were inclined to assist, the general attitude was no more favorable than it had been in France and the loan was not effected. Addressing himself to German financiers, the Turkish minister again found difficulty because of the manner in which German resources are already being tied up in Turkish development; nevertheless arrangements for the loan were promised by German and Austrian capitalists. The connection between diplomacy and finance has never been so strikingly illustrated before as in the case of these financial negotiations.

The Turkish government desires to secure the abolition of the restrictions imposed upon it under the capitulations. It has already obtained the pledge of Austria-Hungary and even of Russia to this policy, but here again Great Britain and France have assumed a negative attitude and are resisting an immediate modification of treaty arrangements in order to make sure of the proper protection of their national interests in the Levantine lands. A visit of Hakki Pasha at Marienbad, where he had an interview with Baron Aehrenthal and Herr Kiderlen-Wächter, led to rumors that an agreement had been made and that Turkey had bound herself to act conjointly with the Triple Alliance. The formation of such an agreement has not been confirmed. That for the time being there is an extensive co-incidence of interests between these powers has already been pointed out. It was also reported that a military agreement had been formed between Turkey and Roumania for joint action in certain eventualities. While, in general, Roumania has found herself for reasons of national interest and protection drawn to the side of Turkey and the central powers as against Russia, the existence of a definite treaty has not been authoritatively admitted.¹ The relations

¹ In December, the Turkish legation at Sofia was entered at night and a series of papers relating to Roumania were stolen. It is believed that the theft was of a political nature, and intended to secure evidence of a Roumanian secret treaty.

between Servia and Austria-Hungary were very friendly during this year. The difficulties concerning Bosnia having been settled it seems that Servian suspicions of Russia have revived and that she prefers to cast her lot with Austria and Turkey for the time being. The Prince of Montenegro has assumed the royal title. As his principality has always had close relations with Russia, this move was not looked upon with special favor by the Servian government, especially as it seemed to foreshadow a plan for the eventual absorption of Servia by the smaller country to the south. In connection with the assumption of the royal dignity, Nicholas of Montenegro formally denounced the article of the treaty of Berlin, which prohibits warships entering the Port of Antivari. As the sanctity of this convention had been considerably impaired by the action of Austria, no objection seems to have been made to this further paring down of its provisions, although it gives Russia a friendly port in the Adriatic Sea.

The situation in Persia has not been materially modified. Russia has tightened her grip upon northern Persia and has recently attempted to negotiate a loan which would put Persian financial administration more fully under her control. The internal conditions of this unhappy country have not improved. The government seems to be unable to enforce its authority in all parts of the kingdom and to resist the encroachment of foreign powers. Turkish inroads on the western frontier have also continued unabated. In November, Great Britain made the demand upon the government that the commercial routes of southern Persia should be effectually policed so as to make life and property secure; in default of which, at the expiration of three months, Great Britain will herself undertake such policing, defraying the expenses by a set charge of ten per cent upon the customs of the Persian Gulf. In its reply the Persian government urges that it would itself be able to maintain order, if it were allowed to increase its income by raising the import duty 10 per cent and by taking up a loan to which ruinous political conditions were not attached. Great interest was aroused by a report, current early in January, 1911, that the United States had been requested by the Persian government to furnish financial advisers.

THE FAR EAST

The most significant development in the Far East, as already pointed out, is the treaty between Japan and Russia of July 4, 1910. The treaty contains the following Provisions:

The contracting parties begin by declaring that their object is the consolidation of peace in the Far East.

(1) To this end they promise to assist each other in the development of their respective railway systems, and to abstain from all prejudicial competition.

(2) "Each of the high contracting parties undertakes to maintain and respect the *status quo* in Manchuria, resulting from all the treaties, conventions, and other arrangements concluded up to this date, either between Russia and Japan, or between these two powers and China."

(3) "In the event of anything arising of a nature to threaten the *status quo* mentioned above, the two high contracting parties shall enter each time into communication with each other with a view of coming to an understanding as to the measures they may think it necessary to take for the maintenance of the said *status quo*."

It is apparent that the two powers have no intention of quitting Manchuria or of giving up the interests which in one way or another they have acquired in that Chinese dependency. The Chinese government and people themselves have been very restive in view of this evident consolidation of Russo-Japanese influence in Manchuria. The attempt to hold open and develop that province through the construction of a railway from Chin-Chow on the Yellow Sea to Aigun on the Amur River, in which project China had the support of the American government and financiers, has not as yet been possible of realization on account of the decided opposition of Russia. The Russians consider the scheme as hurtful to their interests because it would bring Chinese settlers into northern Manchuria and would give China a direct hold upon that part of the provinces.

The convention for the Hankow railway loan was finally concluded in May, 1910. According to its provisions, a loan of

\$30,000,000 is to be raised by the coöperation of the United States, Great Britain, Germany and France. This convention establishes a new principle in the policy of Chinese development. Hitherto the use of foreign capital so necessary to China has been resisted by public opinion in that country, on account of the fear that the danger of foreign spheres of influence might again be incurred. But, the practice of making a loan international, not only has the advantage of giving each nation desirous of participating in the development of China a chance to do so, but also of protecting China against the localization of foreign influence in connection with provincial financial administration. Under this arrangement China need no longer fear to make use of the advantages offered by foreign capital. Joint fiscal operations in which all the powers are equally interested contain no danger to China's autonomy, but, on the contrary, will enable China the sooner to strengthen her economic organization.

The annexation of Korea to Japan was effected on August 22, 1910. While it was expected that the protectorate over the Korean empire would give way to a complete absorption of that country on the part of Japan, yet the treaty of annexation came somewhat as a surprise. The treaty itself, the last made in the name of the Korean emperor, makes a complete and permanent cession of sovereignty to the emperor of Japan. Appropriate ranks and titles are provided for the Korean royal family. Peerages and pecuniary bounties are to be conferred on certain Koreans on account of meritorious services. The promise is made that Koreans who accept the new régime loyally and in good faith and are duly qualified shall be employed in the public service in Korea. The name of the former empire is officially changed to Chosen. In a declaration of the imperial government of August 29, certain arrangements are made which are of a special interest to the foreign powers. Through the annexation existing Korean treaties are, of course, abrogated. The foreigners residing in Korea will therefore no longer enjoy immunity from the local jurisdiction of Japan, although matters actually pending will be allowed to be carried to their final decision in the consular tribunals. For a period of ten years, however, Japan will allow the present rates

of customs duties to continue as well as the charges on shipping, such as tonnage dues. It is also provided that imports from Japan and Japanese vessels entering the open ports of Korea shall be subject to the same duties as are paid by foreigners. The freedom of carrying on the coasting trade between open ports in Korea and between these and open ports in Japan is also accorded to foreign ships whose sovereigns have treaties with Japan. These arrangements are fully in accord with the "open door" policy. The consolidation of Japanese dominion has been accepted by the powers without objection. Russia, had she been stronger, might have interposed difficulties, but she had just made her treaty with Japan concerning Manchuria and had undoubtedly in advance given her consent to the establishment of the new situation.

As the commercial treaties of Japan with nearly all powers will expire during the year 1911, preparatory work is being done towards creating new tariff arrangements. As a basis for the negotiations a new customs tariff has been accepted by the parliament. The basic principles of this new legislation consist in the levying of low duties upon raw materials needed by the Japanese industries; high protection for those simpler products of industry which Japan is ready to furnish; and, again, lower duties upon complicated machinery which can as yet not be produced in Japan but is necessary for the development of industrial life. During the year 1910, negotiations were carried on with the various powers for the purpose of initiating new commercial agreements. The Japanese government decided to carry on this preliminary work, not with the diplomatic representatives at Tokyo but through her own ministers in foreign capitals. In this way she is certain to avoid concerted action that might be taken by the diplomatic corps at Tokyo; by carrying the matter into the foreign countries she herself retains the key to the diplomatic situation. It is the purpose of Japan to create a customs tariff that will be based entirely upon the needs of her own national life and will in no sense be dictated by the demands of foreign interests. France and the United States are the only important countries whose imports from Japan exceeds their exports to that

country; all other industrial nations, but especially Great Britain, have more to lose through an unfavorable tariff arrangement on the part of Japan.

FOREIGN RELATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES

A number of important agreements were made with Great Britain during the past year. The convention concluded January 11, 1909, relating to boundary waters between the United States and Canada, was finally ratified in May 1910. It provides for the free navigation of boundary streams and lakes, fixes the amount of water that may be diverted for purposes of power production, and establishes a joint high commission with powers to adjust questions which may in the future arise concerning the use of boundary waters. A treaty was concluded on May 21, 1910, fixing the international boundary line between the United States and Canada in and near Passamaquoddy Bay. A preliminary diplomatic agreement has also been made, providing for the arbitration of pecuniary claims now existing in favor of one of these governments against the other. The International Fisheries Commission appointed under the treaty of 1908, has formulated and recommended uniform regulations covering the fisheries in the boundary waters of Canada and the United States. These regulations, before becoming effective on our part, must be given legal sanction through act of congress. Throughout the year negotiations have been going on for the formation of a commercial treaty between Canada and the United States, on the basis of reciprocity, and steps were also taken towards the creation of an international railway commission to deal with problems of control, adjustment, and joint service, arising in connection with the international railways.

The dispute concerning the North Atlantic fisheries was finally decided on September 7, by the Hague Tribunal. The decision held that reasonable regulations may be made by the governments of Newfoundland and Canada with respect to coast fisheries. Should the United States dispute the reasonableness, the matter is to be submitted to an international commission. American

fishing vessels are free from the requirement of customs entry and from the payment of dues; they are at liberty to engage fishermen of British nationality; and with respect to commercial rights, such as buying food and bait, they shall enjoy in the bays, harbors, and creeks of Newfoundland the same treatment as is accorded them by convention in Labrador.

Diplomatic negotiations were taken up with Germany in connection with the new potash syndicate law, which in its operations affected adversely American companies interested in the potash production of Germany.

Early in the year an American vessel was sent to Liberia in order to assist the authorities of that country in restoring order in certain disaffected regions. A commission was then appointed by the American government for the purpose of investigating conditions in Liberia and of giving the government of that country aid in improving the economic and financial situation.

A special ambassador was sent to Constantinople in return for a similar ceremonious visit to this country, and with orders to express to the Ottoman government the desire of the United States to contribute to the larger economic and commercial development initiated by the new régime in Turkey. American citizens are beginning to interest themselves extensively in economic enterprises in Turkish dominions. Thus, the Ottoman-American Development Company has obtained concessions from the Turkish government for the building of railways and the operation of mines. It is the purpose of this company to open up Kurdistan by building a railway from the Mediterranean to Sivas. Valuable mining rights in copper-bearing regions have also been obtained by it. The concessions provide that half of the capital of the exploitation company is to be reserved for Turkish subscribers, and also that the employes of the company, with the exception of the managers, are to be of Turkish nationality. The entry of American capital and enterprise upon this field was not altogether welcome to the German interests in the Near East.

The position taken by the United States in Chinese affairs has already been alluded to. In addition to favoring the development of railway communication in China, the American govern-

ment also gave assistance to negotiations between China and a group of American capitalists for a loan of \$50,000,000, to be employed chiefly in currency reform. In the treaty which the United States made with China in 1903, it was pledged that a uniform national coinage should be introduced. In the following years commissioners of both countries consulted with each other concerning the best methods of effecting this important reform. The negotiations for the present loan are an outcome of these various steps.

Congress, in June, passed a law providing for the appointment of a commission of five members to be appointed by the President of the United States, "to consider the expediency of utilizing existing international agencies for the purpose of limiting the armaments of the nations of the world by international agreement, and of constituting the combined navies of the world an international force for the preservation of universal peace, and to consider any other means to diminish the expenditures of government for military purposes and to lessen the probabilities of war." Appointments under this law were not made during the year because the President desired first to obtain the views of other governments upon this matter and to ascertain their willingness to coöperate in making this work effective. Negotiations were also continued in pursuance of the suggestion made by the American government that the International Prize Court when established should be endowed with the functions of an arbitral court of justice. A number of favorable replies were received in the course of the year.

In addition to the North Atlantic fisheries case, the United States was a party to another arbitration before the Hague tribunal, in connection with the claim of the Orinoco Steamship Company against Venezuela. A protocol has been adopted by the United States and Mexico, submitting to the Mexican Boundary Commission, to which for this purpose some prominent citizen of Canada is to be added, the question of sovereignty over the Chamizal tract which is now a part of the City of El Paso, Texas, and lies north of the Rio Grande, although formerly it lay to the south, that river having changed its course.

LATIN AMERICA

The Fourth Pan American Conference was held at Buenos Aires during July and August. All American republics with the exception of Bolivia were represented. The Conference took a prominent part in the commemoration of the year of independence by several of the Latin American republics. In its diplomatic work it devoted itself to the formulation of a number of conventions and resolutions dealing with economic and administrative matters. Three conventions were signed, providing for the international protection of trademarks, patents, and copyrights. The conventions of the universal unions on these matters were followed as models. Formalities for international copyright were reduced to a minimum, and two bureaus for the registration of trademarks were established, one at Havana, the other at Rio de Janeiro. The Conference also renewed the convention concerning the arbitration of pecuniary claims which was originally adopted at Mexico and had been extended at Rio. Thirteen powers had become signatories to this treaty. A draft convention was framed concerning the organization of the union of American republics and especially the work of its organ, the Pan-American Union, at Washington. A series of resolutions were adopted dealing with such important and practical matters as the work and organization of the Pan-American Union, the Pan-American railway, international communication by steamships, sanitary police, the interchange of professors and students between American universities, consular documents, customs regulations, and commercial statistics.

Conditions in some of the Central American republics were still confused and unsettled during the year 1910. In Nicaragua the revolutionary movement against the government of Sr. Madriz was ultimately successful and a new administration under the temporary headship of Sr. Estrada was set up. Diplomatic relations were reestablished with the United States, and the American government was asked to assist the authorities of Nicaragua in adjusting the financial conditions of that country. Negotiations were carried on throughout the year for the purpose

of refunding the debt of Honduras. A group of American bankers had expressed their willingness to advance funds for this purpose as well as for the construction of railways in the republic. Arrangements were not, however, entirely completed, and towards the end of the year revolutionary movements disturbed again the peace of Honduras. In an address made at Philadelphia in June, Secretary Knox expressed the view it that would be desirable that railways built in Central America should be neutralized so as to be used exclusively as instruments for the peaceful development of these countries.

The Second Central American Conference held its session at San Salvador in 1910. Conventions for the following purposes were adopted: the unification of the consular service of the five republics; monetary uniformity on a gold basis; commercial reciprocity among the member states; the adoption of the metric system of weights and measures; the relations of the Central American bureau to the governments; and the establishment of the pedagogic institute provided for in the Washington treaty. These conventions are adopted *ad referendum*, subject to ratification by the respective governments.

Towards the end of the year diplomatic relations were established between Colombia and Panama, and a special commissioner of the latter republic took up his residence in Bogota. The year was a rather uneventful one for Colombia and Venezuela. Some ill feeling was manifested in parts of Colombia against North American residents by reason of popular dissatisfaction with the conditions of certain concessions that had been granted.

The relations between Peru and Ecuador were strained throughout the course of the year. The boundary dispute between these two countries had originally been submitted to the King of Spain for arbitration. Before the award was made it became known what the leanings of the King were and as Ecuador did not consider his attitude favorable, it withdrew from the arbitration, leaving the controversy undecided. For a while hostilities were threatened, but, invoking the provisions of the Hague Peace Conference concerning the mediation by friendly powers, the United States, Brazil, and Argentina joined in an effort to mediate

between the two contestants, being also aided therein by Chile. In this manner war was avoided, although friction threatening the renewal of hostilities continued until the end of the year, when finally both Peru and Ecuador indicated their willingness to submit the dispute to the Hague Tribunal. This situation gives proof of the value of the friendly understanding between all American powers as well as of the provisions made by the Hague convention, for joint efforts to mediate in cases of conflict.

The relations between Peru and Chile did not materially improve during the year. There again arose a specific controversy with respect to the conquered province of Tacna. This province has remained ecclesiastically a part of the Peruvian bishopric of Arequipa. Chile had for some time complained of the political activities of the priests in Tacna; and it finally made a definite demand that the Peruvian priests should be withdrawn and Chileans appointed in their place. As this demand was not complied with, certain Peruvian ecclesiastics suspected of political propaganda were expelled from Tacna. In consequence, diplomatic relations between the two countries were again endangered and the Peruvian minister was recalled from Santiago.

Bolivia and Brazil concluded a commercial treaty on August 12, 1910. Aside from the clauses ordinarily contained in such treaties, this convention provides for mutual freedom of transit upon the rivers of the two countries; and it also makes arrangements for several customs stations to be located by each of the powers at certain points within the territory of the other. During this year, Bolivia made a new commercial treaty with Germany and established with that country mutuality of legations. A Bolivian legation was created in Berlin, the incumbent of which is also accredited to Austria-Hungary.

Argentina, and especially its capital, Buenos Aires, were throughout the year centres of international manifestations of friendship and coöperation. The celebration of the centenary of independence was followed by the sessions of the Pan-American Conference; at the same time a series of notable exhibits in the fine arts, in industry, and agriculture were held. The Pan-American Conference resolved that there should be maintained at Buenos Aires a permanent exhibition of American products.

The return of the president-elect of Argentina, Dr. Saenz Pena, from Europe to Buenos Aires in August, was made the occasion of enthusiastic demonstrations of friendship at the ports in Brazil and Uruguay touched by the noted statesman. The president-elect took part in the closing sessions of the Pan-American conference as one of the delegates of his country. In his inaugural message he made the following declaration with respect to foreign politics:

“The international politics of my government will be animated with friendship for Europe and with a spirit of fraternity for America. I share the Pan-American view, in so far as it stands for respect of the sovereignty of all the states of the continent, a bond of harmony and friendship between them, together with common deliberations upon our mutual economic interests. Argentine politics must neither be one-sidedly American nor exclusively European.”

In the course of the year the Argentinian government contracted with North American manufacturers for the construction of two battleships and other naval equipment. In August, Argentina concluded a treaty of commerce with Nicaragua which contains the customary provisions. It is, however, interesting that in providing for mutual most favored nation treatment, arrangements which may have been made with adjoining countries are excepted. A similar provision is contained in the Italo-Chilean treaty of commerce which reserves from the operation of the most-favored-nation clause any commercial arrangements which Chile may have made with South or Central American states.

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES

The results obtained at the Pan-American Conference at Buenos Aires have already been mentioned in speaking of American affairs. It is not our purpose here to give an exhaustive list of international meetings held during the year 1910² but only to indicate the work of a few of these meetings which are of special significance.

² Such data may be found in the *Annuaire de la Vie Internationale*.

On April 18, the international conference for the suppression of the white slave trade met at Paris. Fifteen powers were represented. The conference resolved in a satisfactory manner certain difficulties with respect to divergencies in national legislation as to the age of majority and of the transmission of warrants, which had delayed the ratification of the treaty made in 1902. The methods of the police supervision were also further developed. The conference extended the system of international police coöperation to activities for the suppression of commerce in immoral writings and objects.

On May 31, an international emigration conference met at London to consider the possibility of coöperation with respect to emigration laws and the protection of emigrants against exploitation by various agencies. The international conference for the unification of the law relating to bills of exchange met at the Hague on June 23. In July, the international railway congress met at Bern; it dealt almost exclusively with technical subjects of railway management. The telegraph and telephone congress met at Paris in September.

The international conference on maritime law held its sessions from September 12 to 20, during which time it elaborated and accepted a convention concerning the law of salvage and collision. An international conference on aerial rights had convened in June. It was called for the purpose of elaborating proper rules for aerial navigation, the rights of nations to control the air above their territory, and the obligations of aeronauts with respect to foreign territorial sovereignty. During the sessions serious differences of a fundamental character developed. It was, therefore, decided upon motion of the chief British delegate, to adjourn for five months in order that the governments might consider the questions which had arisen. It seems that certain powers including Great Britain did not wish to yield the right entirely to close their frontiers against aerial vessels coming from abroad, whenever such a course seemed desirable. The continental powers are on the whole more favorable to liberal rules governing the movements of airships across national boundaries.

In the above account we have already alluded to the action of the Hague tribunal during the past year and the utilization of other provisions of the Hague convention for the pacific settlement of international disputes. The conception of a standing international court which seemed very novel only a few years ago has already become one of the things so familiar as to seem essential to the proper conduct of international affairs. A noteworthy indication of the manner in which the use of international arbitration is becoming more common, is given by the agreement between Russia and Turkey, concluded May 17, under which a standing dispute concerning deferred interest payments on the war debt of 1878, is to be submitted to the Hague tribunal. A general arbitration treaty was adopted by Russia and Spain, on August 16. A far-reaching suggestion was made by President Taft in New York, on March 22, when he declared that it ought not to be necessary to except from the operation of arbitration treaties, questions involving national honor.

In July it was announced that the King of Italy, after careful consideration, had prepared a plan for an international agreement for limiting armaments and military expenditures. The plan provided for proportional reductions in standing military forces. It was submitted to the different governments by whom it is now being considered. A number of the governments have already taken steps to appoint committees under the resolution passed by the last Hague conference for the purpose of making preparatory studies for the work to be undertaken at the next meeting.

While no direct institutional changes were introduced during this year in international organization, a number of nations have ratified the convention for the establishment of an international prize court, and, as already has been indicated, the suggestion of giving this court also the powers of a general arbitral tribunal is finding favor among the powers. In every way the year 1910 has strengthened the respect for international law and the desire to have international affairs managed, not in a haphazard or capricious way, but in harmony with the broad principles of equity, justice, and common human welfare.